

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/979,563

Applicant(s)

KASTURI ET AL.

Examiner

Brian P Mruk

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2, 10 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In instant claim 2, a space should be inserted between "about" and "1,000,000" for grammatical purposes.

In instant claim 10, the phrase "less than or equal to 5% or the value" should be amended to recite "less than or equal to 5% of the value" for grammatical purposes.

In instant claim 19, the phrase "consisting of, liquid" should be amended to recite, "consisting of liquid" for grammatical purposes.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1751

5. Instant claims 1, 6, 7 and 11 contain the term “effective amount of a suds stabilizer”. The term “effective amount” is considered vague and indefinite, because the claim fails to state the function that is to be achieved by the suds stabilizer. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required. See MPEP Section 2173.05(d).

6. Instant claims 6, 7 and 11 contain the term “effective amount of a deterative surfactant”. The term “effective amount” is considered vague and indefinite, because the claim fails to state the function that is to be achieved by the deterative surfactant. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required. See MPEP Section 2173.05(d).

7. In instant claims 1 and 14, the group “bond” in the Markush Listing for the variable “L” renders the claims vague and indefinite, since it is unclear what the term “bond” encompasses. The examiner suggests that the group “bond” should be removed from instant claims 1 and 14. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

8. In instant claim 10, the examiner notes that the variable “j” is not defined in the claim. This renders the claim vague and indefinite, since it is unclear what values j encompasses. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

9. Instant claims 2-5, 8-10 and 12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being dependent upon a claim with the above addressed 112 problem (i.e. claims 1, 7 and 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jeschke et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,784,789.

Jeschke et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,784,789, discloses an aqueous cleaning composition for cleaning hard surfaces comprising 0.15% by weight of an amphoteric polymer containing 10 moles of dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate and 1 mole of acrylic acid, and various amphoteric, nonionic and anionic surfactants (see col. 4, lines 21-36 & Examples 1-12), per the requirements of the instant claims. Therefore, instant claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 are anticipated by Jeschke et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,784,789.

12. Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aronson et al, EP 013,585.

Aronson et al, EP 013,585, discloses a light duty, liquid hand dishwashing composition comprising a mixture of anionic and nonionic surfactants, and a copolymer of N-vinylpyrrolidone and dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate, wherein the copolymer has a molecular weight of 40,000-1,500,000 (see abstract & page 2, line 30-page 10, line

11). Specifically, note the Examples in Tables 1-6, which disclose compositions comprising various surfactants and copolymers of N-vinylpyrrolidone and dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate, used in a process for washing dishes by hands, per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 are anticipated by Aronson et al, EP 013,585.

13. Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winkler et al, EP 308,190.

Winkler et al, EP 308,190, discloses a mild toilet bar for cleansing skin comprising anionic and amphoteric surfactants (see page 3, lines 51-63), and zwitterionic or cationic copolymers, such as copolymers of dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate and acrylamide (see page 5, line 30-page 7, line 26), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note the Examples in Tables 2 and 4. Therefore, instant 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 claims are anticipated by Winkler et al, EP 308,190.

14. Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishii et al, GB 2,104,091.

Ishii et al, GB 2,104,091, discloses a detergent composition comprising 0.01-10% by weight of an amphoteric polymer, such as a copolymer of acrylic acid and dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate (see page 2, line 16-page 3, line 20), and adjunct ingredients, such as surfactants, solvents, hydrotropes, chelating agents and thickeners (see page 3, lines 21-41), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically,

Art Unit: 1751

note Examples 1-3. Therefore, instant claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-24 are anticipated by Ishii et al, GB 2,104,091

Double Patenting

15. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

16. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No.

6,528,477. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,477 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,477). Therefore, instant claims 1-27 are an obvious formulation in view of claim 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,477.

Art Unit: 1751

17. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,012. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,012 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,012). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,012.

18. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,589,926. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,589,926 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,589,926). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,589,926.

19. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,811. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-16 of

Art Unit: 1751

U.S. Patent No. 6,277,811 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,811). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,811.

20. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,631. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,631 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,631). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,631.

21. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,521,577. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,521,577 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,521,577). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,521,577.

22. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,372,708. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,372,708 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,372,708). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,372,708.

23. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,234. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,234 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,234). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,234.

24. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,476. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably

Art Unit: 1751

distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention and claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,476 claim a similar detergent composition comprising a polymer suds stabilizer, a surfactant, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,476). Therefore, instant claims 1-24 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,476.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Mruk whose telephone number is (703) 305-0728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta, can be reached on (703) 308-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310 (Before Final) and (703) 872-9311 (After Final).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Bm

Brian Mruk
September 9, 2003

Brian P. Mruk

Brian P. Mruk
Patent Examiner
Tech Center 1700